

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session**  
**Council Chambers, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ**  
**Thursday, October 13, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL**

Chair Losoff called the work session to order at 3:30 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present:** Chair Marty Losoff, Vice Chair Kathy Levin and Commissioners Randy Barcus, Eric Brandt – arrived at 3:30 p.m., Avrum Cohen, Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer.

**Staff Present:** Warren Campbell, Roxanne Holland, Audree Juhlin, Cynthia Lovely, Ryan Mortillaro, Cari Meyer, Robert Pickels and Donna Puckett

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS & SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS**

Audree Juhlin announced that the City Council approved an ordinance related to SB1350 and short-term vacation rentals, and Robert Pickels added that it was a fairly simple ordinance, because there is very little we can do in regulating short-term vacation rentals. The two key features were the requirement of a business license for every establishment at which short-term rental activity will occur, and within that business license application, we will ask for the designation of an emergency contact, which is the most key feature for the City, because we want to be able to identify who is engaged in the activity and keep track of that for our sales tax purposes. Beyond that, there is very little that we can regulate, so the ordinance was very short.

The Chair asked about enforcement possibilities, and Robert Pickels explained that we will have to monitor it for a while and see what the sales tax impact is, because the Department of Revenue has the authority to collect and remit the sales tax, so we won't know whether or not any enforcement is necessary until we monitor the activity.

**3. CONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS THROUGH PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURES:**

- a. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for a Conditional Use Permit to modify existing rooftop wireless equipment at 254 State Route 89A (Orchards Inn). A general description of the area affected includes but is not necessarily limited to the area east of the intersection of State Route 89A and Jordan Road. The subject property is approximately 1.01 acres and is zoned PD (Planned Development). APN: 401-12-001A. Applicant: T-Mobile West LLC Case number: PZ16-00006 (CUP)**

*Note: Commissioner Brandt joined the Commission on the dais at this time.*

**Presentation, Cari Meyer:** Cari explained that this is a Conditional Use Permit request for a wireless facility modification. Cari identified the location of the property and the surrounding area and indicated that the property is about one acre in size and zoned Planned Development. The Orchards hotel has been there since 1974 and the wireless has been there since 2008.

Cari explained that the applicant is proposing some modification to the facility, including relocation and a slight couple-inch increase in height, and our Wireless Ordinance requires an approved Conditional Use Permit. They submitted all of the required application materials, and the application has been reviewed by CityScape, who is the City's wireless consultant. Based on their review, the application is in compliance with all City and federal ordinances, and they did recommend approval of the application.

Cari stated that the applicant submitted photo simulations; however, there is really no change from the front elevation, and the rear elevation shows where there would be a small facility as outlined in the Staff Report. Based on staff's evaluation, the location meets the required findings for a Conditional Use Permit, and as reviewed by CityScape, it meets the requirements for a wireless facility. Additionally, the applicant completed a Citizen Participation Plan and didn't receive any comments. Staff completed the public noticing requirements and one question was received regarding a clarification of the height. All of the reviewing agency items were what would be required at the building permit stage, so we are recommending approval of this application.

**Commission's Questions and Comments:**

Chair Losoff noted that the consultants had no problem with it, and Commissioner Klein asked how long the Conditional Use Permit would be valid. Cari explained that Conditional Use Permits for wireless do not have an expiration date.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he is completely satisfied, because there are no traffic implications, they are only asking for two inches higher, and they are still within an acceptable range. They are doing it to increase T-Mobile's ability to have their phones and internet work, and staff did a thorough job on the written materials.

Chair Losoff stated that he would entertain a motion; however, Cari pointed out that it is a public hearing.

*The Chair opened the public comment period and, having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.*

***MOTION: Commissioner Cohen moved for approval of case number PZ16-00006 for Conditional Use Permit for T-Mobile Wireless Facility at Orchards Inn based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Conditional Use Permit findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Barcus seconded the motion.***

Chair Losoff asked if, given our current discussions on wireless with the consultants, this will be factored in when the Land Development Code is changed, so it shouldn't be a problem, and. Audree indicated yes; she is not aware of any problems.

***VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.***

- b. Discussion/possible action regarding a request for an Amendment to a previously approved Development Review to modify the colors and materials board for a new warehouse building at 60 Sinagua Drive. The property is zoned C-2 (General Commercial). A general description of the area affected includes but is not limited to the east side of Sinagua Drive south of Southwest Drive. APN: 408-24-319. Applicant: Larry Garnello Case Number: PZ16-00008 (DEV)**

**Presentation, Cari Meyer:** Cari stated that this is a request for amendment to a Development Review on the Garnello Warehouse project that was approved in June of 2016. She then identified the location of the site and indicated that the lot is currently vacant and is just over one-third of an acre. They have requested some modifications and based on those, staff felt it was appropriate to bring it back to the Commission.

Cari then displayed their previous materials board and indicated that the wall and trim colors were approved as a purple wall with a tan trim; however, they are proposing that based on the materials available, the building would be the more tan in color and have the red rock veneer wainscoting go to the purple color. They would keep the red rock veneer on the columns at the entry way, and the stucco screen wall for screening of the parking lot would become red rock.

The changes to the red rock were the impetus for bringing the project back to the Commission. There is also a slight increase in the maximum height of the building for ventilation; it would still be under the 22 ft. maximum, but we include that as part of this application. Additionally, they are proposing to add a couple of more shrubs to the landscaping in front of the building for further screening.

Cari then showed the site plan and pointed out the wall that would become red rock instead of stucco and the columns that would remain red rock, with the wainscoting becoming stucco. Staff did an evaluation of the project and believes it still meets the requirements for the findings for Development Review, and the applicant conducted another citizen review process as part of this amendment and neither he nor staff received any comments. The reviewing agencies also didn't change their comments, so staff is recommending approval of the Development Review amendment.

**Commission's Questions and Comments:**

Commissioner Cohen recalled a previous concern by a neighbor about two trees and asked what happened to those trees. Cari Meyer stated that they are not proposing any changes to the landscaping.

**Applicant, Mr. Larry Garnello, Sedona, AZ:** Mr. Garnello explained the location of the two trees and indicated that they are going to stay there. One is hurting a little, but she is watering it like crazy and it will be fine. They have no desire to take trees down.

Commissioner Mayer asked if cost was a factor in changing from red rock to red stucco, and Mr. Garnello stated yes, it was about \$50,000 between the rock and footings for the rock.

Chair Losoff indicated that he understood that additional landscaping was discussed to offset and Cari stated yes. The Chair then asked if that is a problem and Cari stated no, the plans show a few extra plants.

*Chair Losoff opened the public comment period and, having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.*

**MOTION: Commissioner Klein moved to approve the proposed Development Review for Garnello Warehouse Amendments as set forth in case number PZ16-00008 based on compliance with all ordinance requirements and satisfaction of the Development Review findings and applicable Land Development Code requirements and the conditions as outlined in the Staff Report. Commissioner Cohen seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.**

The Chair commented that he and staff had discussed if this should even come before the Commission or if it should be an administrative decision, but we thought there were enough modifications in the overall appearance to bring it back for review.

**c. Discussion/possible action regarding the Draft Schnebly Community Focus Area Plan  
Applicant: City of Sedona Case Number: PZ16-00010 (CFA)**

**Presentation, Cynthia Lovely:** Cynthia indicated that two Commissioners weren't able to attend the September 29<sup>th</sup> and October 4<sup>th</sup> sessions, so as a recap, the major points discussed included the Vision Statement and a recommendation to revise it, which was done in the redline version; a discussion on the Community Expectations from the Community Plan, which was the green inset box on page 3 taken directly from the Community Plan; a discussion about traffic, and a discussion about the proposed new zoning district, in particular lodging. We will continue that part of the discussion today, and then there was some discussion about the conservation and preservation of Oak Creek, as well as creek access and the proposed creekwalk.

Cynthia stated that today staff would like to give a very basic overview of how we got to where we are and discuss some potential revisions based on the Commission's comments. Cynthia explained that the foundation of the vision was the character, and it seems there was agreement on what that should be, so that hasn't really changed from what was in the Community Plan's Appendix B vision for the neighborhood. With the revisions, the front page should show the redlined version, and there was one suggestion that instead of saying "small scale", it should say "varied, modestly scaled" buildings, so we can discuss that toward the end as a potential change.

Cynthia then referenced a rendering that Max Licher had drawn that is similar to what is in the Plan, and on page 11 if you remember the scenarios, this is the same type of concept, but the one on the top assumes you would be developing under current zoning, which is Residential and it is drawn showing pretty much wall-to-wall houses, similar to what we have in the draft plan. The lower one is something Max drew that is very similar to our vision of what you could do. There is sort of a clustering of buildings with swaths of open space, and since that is hard to read, she found a couple of others. Chair Losoff noted it is in the packet on page 11.

Cynthia pointed out that looking at current zoning versus vision, it is that same concept with just different illustrations, and these were pulled off of the internet. They are a very common approach and sometimes called "conservation subdivisions", and again that is the same concept. If you went with the current zoning, you have kind of evenly-spaced housing lots that encroach into open space. On both of those scenarios, you could cluster and leave more open space, and the other one is a different example of clustering with fingers of open space around it. These are all the same concept with different views.

Commissioner Klein asked if this is all within the Planned Area and Cynthia stated they are just examples, but limiting the new zone to the Planned Area was one of the possible revisions. Commissioner Barcus asked if there is the same number of dwellings in both and Cynthia stated yes. The Commissioner then indicated that it is the same number of dwellings even though it looks like there are fewer. Cynthia again stated that is correct and the Appendix images are pretty much aligned with the Planned Area we have been talking about.

Cynthia indicated that everyone seems to agree that the current zoning is probably not going to achieve the vision for this area, and that is the reason for most of the recommendations in this plan, and as to how we can achieve this vision, one way would be through a mix of land uses that would be implemented through a new district in the CFA Plan. The new proposed district has a variety of land uses and open space on page 20, where we talk about permitted uses, such as lodging, campground, etc., but the whole idea is the mix that would include open space. We wouldn't see the maximum number, because you have to consider that the point is to try to preserve open space. Another way to think about it is as a pie and these could all be pieces of the pie. There have been some comments in other CFAs as to whether or not we want to start a ratio of the pie, but at this point, you could leave it flexible since it is so site specific with the floodplain, Oak Creek and the variable topography with hillsides and important viewsheds, so that is one reason to keep it flexible and not specify how much of each land use.

Cynthia stated that a question of whether or not we were going to allow lodging came up last week, and if so, how much and where. Staff came up with a couple of ideas for discussion and one of them is in the redlined version. The original draft dated August didn't limit the new district or lodging, it was within the entire CFA, so one idea redlined on page 20 is limiting it to the Planned Area of roughly 43 acres, taken from the Community Plan's Future Land Use Map. The areas outside of the Planned Area would not be eligible for the new zone, and those properties within the Planned Area would have an option to rezone to the new district.

Cynthia indicated that another thought would be to keep the same Planned Area limit, but add on a restriction for lodging, which would be no more than twice the current zoning density. Some of the property is zoned RS-10 with four units per acre and if you want to rezone, the

maximum lodging would be eight units per acre. Another one would be to add to the last one a limit on lodging to half of the Planned Area, so of the 43 acres, we wouldn't allow more than 22 acres of lodging. The rationale for that, like in the Soldiers Pass discussion, is that we want a mix and don't want any one use to dominate, and that would be one way to approach that.

Commissioner Cohen asked how many acres the Marriott covers and Audree indicated that the total property is approximately seven acres, and the Courtyard is about four of those acres. The Commissioner then asked Cynthia how many acres she is proposing. Cynthia referenced the pie and indicated that a bunch of open space would go into the pie, so even though we are saying half of the area is 22 acres, you are probably still going to have some land remain in Residential, but if they ask to rezone this really sets a ceiling or maximum. We don't envision that 22 acres of lodging would occur, but it places a ceiling on it.

Chair Losoff asked if there had been discussions about having the Heritage District for the entire CFA, and Cynthia pointed out that was the original, before the redlines. The Chair then asked what some of the Commission's issues were on that, and Cynthia stated that the rationale for scaling it down was some concern that it could be too much lodging, camping spread over the entire CFA.

Cynthia stated that staff had another suggestion today that was a good point made by Commissioner Brandt, and she included it as Alternative 4. When we talked about restricting it to the Planned Area, the Commissioner pointed out that would leave out some very important land, so this suggestion would be to forget the restriction about Planned Area. The suggested change was to limit the new zone only to the grey area, but the problem is that our most important viewshed is the hillside that happens to be outside of the Planned Area. She then pointed out the hillside in the panoramic photo taken from Uptown, and indicated that if that is what we want, we need an incentive for developers and they need the option to rezone, so we are proposing Alternative 4 that would not restrict it to the Planned Area, and the entire CFA would be eligible for the rezoning.

Commissioner Cohen stated that the Plan says to protect the view from S.R.89A as best we can, and he asked what that change does to the view. Cynthia explained that it says the two property owners of that hillside could rezone their property; otherwise, it is zoned RS-18 or two houses per acre, and if it were to develop, probably more of an impact to the viewshed is going to be the driveways and roads to the houses, because it is so steep you would probably end up with a switchback road. Commissioner Mayer asked how many acres that is and Cynthia stated that she thinks that parcel is seven acres and the separate corner piece is probably one or two acres.

Cynthia explained that a sample scenario might be that the two parcels are owned by the same owner, so if they wanted to rezone to the new district and come up with a site plan that covers both parcels, the idea would be that they would cluster the development in the low area and preserve the upper hillside, and that was one of the scenarios in the last presentation. Commissioner Mayer then asked if the landowner would have to agree, and Cynthia replied if they are interested in rezoning to the new district.

Commissioner Mayer then asked if they put in a request for rezoning to lodging, and Cynthia clarified that they would request rezoning to the new district, which allows lodging, but we would still have some restriction of not wanting a dominate land use with this particular alternative, so one possible revision would be those same restrictions that you can't exceed twice your current density, and the entire area or CFA . . . Chair Losoff interjected that is not limited to half of the Planned Area; that is not saying where, it is just making a general statement.

Commissioner Cohen asked what the new yellow circle would do to his view from Cold Stone Creamery and what it would do to his view if he sits along the historical walk fence. Cynthia

Lovely stated that you now see the hillside as it is with no development, and then you could see more houses if developed under current zoning, and probably a road cut across the hillside. Commissioner Cohen then asked if this protects the view better, and Cynthia indicated yes, if they choose to rezone under the new district and cluster the development.

Vice Chair Levin referenced Alternative 2 and the addition of seven acres for a total of 50 in the Planned Area, and then using the rationale for Alternative 1, if you were going to dedicate half of that, it would be 25 acres versus 22 acres in the prior proposal. The Vice Chair asked if that is RS-10 and Cynthia stated it is RS-18, two units per acre. The Vice Chair then stated it would only be 2 x 7 or 14 added to the existing 43; however, Cynthia referenced the Creative Life Center property and Audree indicated that they are both about seven acres for a total of 14 acres. Cynthia then stated seven plus the corner, so Vice Chair Levin suggested rounding that to 10, so 53 if we add in the other portion, and with the scenario in Alternative 1, if we applied 50% of the total area to one designated land use, that would be roughly 25 acres.

Cynthia referenced Alternative 4 and explained that limiting the Planned Area was crossed out, because the properties outside the Planned Area have viewsheds as well. Chair Losoff then asked if, before going into a lot of questions, there are Alternatives 5, 6 and 7. Cynthia indicated that staff has a chart comparing the four alternatives plus a question mark as to whether or not the Commission has additional ideas.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that his first question is about a very important point about the current zoning and how the driveway construction may be the more visible feature. With our paint color requirements, the houses will blend into the background and existing viewscape, but you can't blend in a switchback driveway, and he just wanted to be sure that was what staff was calling out. His second question is from having a little trouble with the math. By doubling the lodging density in half of the space, it seems that we come up with the same number of units, and is that the intention? Cynthia Lovely explained that the intention is the open space, whether it is a viewshed or a floodplain, it is to cluster the development, and the rationale behind twice the current density is to put an incentive out there. How can we entice a property owner to develop in such a way that it would preserve those open space areas – doubling it just gives them a little more incentive. Commissioner Barcus then wanted to clarify that we are not going to limit the size of those lodging units, so . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say that we would have design review criteria that would limit the look. Cynthia Lovely agreed that there is another step involved, so if the CFA Plan is approved with the new zoning district, then the next step is to develop those district regulations and that would also be a public process. The Commissioner stated that he wanted to be clear that in the limitations that may be a first blush reaction to half of the area, we are not restricting size and we are doubling the number, so we need to ensure we are thinking about this in a balanced way.

Commissioner Mayer referenced the hillside and asked if according to the eight lodging units per acre that would give somebody 56 units on those seven acres. Audree Juhlin stated no, it would be based on the current zoning and doubling that, which is two units per acre, so it would be four units per acre. The Commissioner then stated that is like 14 units. He then asked where the access is to that hillside, and Audree stated that for the seven acres, it is an extension of the Creative Life Center off the backside of the parking lot area. Commissioner Mayer then asked if it is the same owner and Audree stated yes. Warren Campbell then added that it would result in that switchback road up the hillside.

Chair Losoff asked to see the slide of the four options and indicated that those are the decisions we need to discuss today. The issue is if nothing changes today, we could build about 260 houses, and this is suggesting how we could minimize that impact and create lodging areas with more open space.

Commissioner Klein referenced the slide with the yellow area and stated that currently you could build 14 houses with a switchback to get to them, and Audree Juhlin stated that is

correct. The Commissioner then asked if lodging is put there aren't you going to have the same switchback, and Audree explained that the CFA is proposing that no construction would be allowed on that hillside. We're saying increase the density in this area and restrict its location from the hillside down to the lower levels, so we are protecting the hillside through the increase in density and the allowance of lodging. Warren then added that it also would provide for a review process over the design of the lodging project. Commissioner Mayer commented it would basically be a cluster on the bottom and Audree indicated that is correct.

Commissioner Klein then stated that staff is saying that in the area in yellow we are going to have no lodging, and staff responded ideally. Warren explained that if we put a zone district in place that looks like we are proposing or a little different, at least it gives a greater opportunity that somebody may choose to implement the zoning district, which would allow us to do a review that we do not do for single-family housing. The Commissioner then stated that he is confused and asked if those seven acres are within the Planned Area and Audree indicated that it is not within the Planned Area. Commissioner Klein then said if we limit lodging to the Planned Area, there will not be any lodging in the yellow area, and Audree stated that there would be houses potentially.

Chair Losoff indicated to keep in mind with the driveways and switchbacks that if we do nothing at all, we could have 260 houses with driveways, etc. He then asked Commissioner Brandt about his suggestion.

Commissioner Brandt stated that he was wondering why all of the focus was on the existing residential area; the Gassaway House over to Quail Ridge and the photo was of that area, but there is another whole area that isn't developed at all, and it could have greater impact visually, so was there a reason it was left out? That is what opened the can of worms that it should be included, but reducing the size of the Planned Area in the past meetings took away the ability to control these areas, so now we are discussing that maybe we do want to control those areas. He also wanted to clarify that the CFA language would set-up the ideas for clustering and the next step would be the actual wording of the implementation as to how that zoning would work, so we are not looking at the details at this point. The Chair then added that we are almost looking conceptually now.

Commissioner Mayer asked if lodging on the bottom of the hillside would be less spread out and guarantee a more condensed area; it would be more confined to an area with the hotel, etc. than residential that could spread out. Audree stated that what he described is exactly the two conditions we have – the existing conditions of no control over the placement of the houses on the hillside or we can implement a new district that gives the tools to the City, Commission and Council to regulate size and placement of the units to protect the open space, hillside and creek access. In exchange for that, we have to offer something that makes the option desirable, and we are recommending the increase in density for lodging.

Commissioner Klein stated that under the current zoning in the Planned Area, we could have four units per acre, so how many total houses would that be? Audree indicated that we had that number in the September 29<sup>th</sup> presentation and it was approximately 260 for the total of RS-18 and RS-10. The Commissioner noted that Audree is talking about the whole area, but the Planned Area is all RS-10; however, Audree stated no, the portion of the Creative Life Center is RS-18 and the other side is zoned RS-10, so RS-18b is two units per acre and the RS10b is four units per acre. The Commissioner then asked if that was all developed with houses, it would be a couple hundred and Audree stated that is correct. Commissioner Klein then indicated that if we say you could have double the lodging as you can residential, how many potential lodging units could that result in, and Audree indicated it was in an earlier slide, and she thinks it was just under 200 potential. Commissioner Klein then asked with double the lodging, how could it be 200 if you could have 200 houses, and Commissioner Barcus explained that you have half of the acreage available to qualify for double the lodging. Commissioner Brandt stated potentially, and Audree added if that is the alternative that the

Commission wants. Commissioner Cohen then asked if that is Alternative 4 and Cynthia Lovely stated that Alternatives 3 and 4 are with half of the acreage.

Audree Juhlin referenced Commissioner Klein's question regarding the Planned Area and indicated that at the last meeting, that was 46.4 acres approximately with 94 housing units possible, so doubling the density would equal 198 lodging units. Commissioner Klein stated that 198 lodging units would have a much greater impact on traffic than 90 residential units; however, Audree stated that it is almost equivalent and the Chair noted that was discussed last time and it was kind of a wash according to the traffic analysis. Commissioner Klein indicated that it depends; if it is a hotel, it is pretty similar.

Commissioner Cohen asked if that is a question for traffic and the Chair stated it had already been answered. A couple of times it was pointed out that lodging units create less traffic in general than houses, and it is basically a wash, but he doesn't know that the Commission wants to get hung up on specific numbers like this; we are getting carried away, and we are looking at a CFA overall concept. Rezoning and other things will come in future steps, when we can get into more of those kinds of issues. Let's hear what the others have said before getting hung up on more of these things.

Cynthia Lovely stated that, in the CFA Plan, the first page had the permitted uses of lodging and residential, and the next page had different uses, one of which is commercial. We had a suggestion that the commercial not be limited to 500 ft., but extend it to 750 ft., which would bring in the Farley Cabin parcel and the land across the street from it. We didn't want commercial as a primary use in the neighborhood, because of the potential for more traffic, but if the commercial is closer to the roundabout that might be more appropriate. Vice Chair Levin asked if staff had an opinion on that, and Audree indicated that staff supported the suggestion.

Cynthia then indicated that next was the question of why we have that limitation for single-family residential, which was a density maximum of one unit per acre, one acre minimum, and the suggestion was to take that out. If you have the ability to have residential, why throw a limitation into this when we want it to be an incentive. We could modify the language to say that single-family residential would not exceed the equivalent density, and the example was RS-10 for four units per acre. The difference is that by being in the new zoning district, you would have the other options, but you could stick with single-family residential, except the design would be different, going back to the examples of clustering and open space.

Cynthia stated that regarding multi-family and why limit it, the suggestion was to remove the density limit and go with the same language about not exceeding your equivalent density, and it seems to fit well with the idea of clustering, because with multi-family, you are clustering even more, again with the goal of preserving open space.

Chair Losoff indicated that one of the main questions is lodging, how much and where, and the four alternatives address that. We also have the things that Cynthia just brought up, so are there any thoughts on the four alternatives?

Vice Chair Levin stated that she had a larger concern, but Cynthia has addressed it by suggesting that we contemplate having the amount of acreage dedicated to lodging, then we could assure ourselves that it wouldn't be lodging-dominant. Her greatest concern was that the area would lose its sense of neighborliness in addition to increasing the commercial along Schnebly Hill and, with the other more commercial uses, bookend it at the north-end of the road. If it stopped feeling like a neighborhood, it could be dominated by more non-residents and tourists than residents. In the beginning, the workgroup, neighbors and community said that they want to preserve those values and that character. Even with the introduction of form and architecture, if the use is targeted to visitors, then it loses a sense of neighborliness, so she is very interested in these alternatives that would enable a greater blend.



Chair Losoff asked if there is one that the Vice Chair prefers, and she stated Alternatives 3 – 4. Cynthia noted that there is a mistake on Alternative 4 at the bottom; it should be limited to half of the CFA, because we removed the Planned Area.

*Chair Losoff opened the public comment period.*

**Ralph Clemmer, owner of the Gassaway House in Sedona, AZ:** Mr. Clemmer stated that these new alternatives just came out, so he is trying to dissect them. He enjoys what the staff has done and he was looking at his current PRD with a final plat for 10 houses, and the livable space is 36,000. Under that plan, it says that he could do 18 lodging or build 10 approved houses, and he did the math with 36,000 livable feet and there is no real incentive for him to go to lodging, so he wants to know if he brings in a plan as a developer and the CFA is approved, is that 36 lodging units, right now it is 20, so if he is going to be incentivized to build less square footage for equal lodging . . . , but as a whole, he thinks staff has done a good job and that was his only question.

*Having no additional requests to speak, the Chair closed the public comment period.*

**Commission's Discussion:**

Commissioner Klein asked if Mr. Clemmer's property is out of the Planned Area and Audree stated it is in the Planned Area.

Chair Losoff asked about the incentives for developers and how this would work. Audree Juhlin stated that the primary incentive is to allow a use that they currently don't have the ability to seek without a Community Plan Amendment. Lodging in this area would require an Amendment to the Community Plan and that would be a Major Amendment. The CFA would remove that step and make it a possibility through a zoning district; that is the biggest incentive. The number of units per acre is next. We are doubling what is allowed by current density for the lodging component and that is another incentive above what is allowed now by 1350. An accessory to that incentive is that the City will work with the property owners, by staff taking the project through the planning process if they voluntarily want the rezoning,.

Vice Chair Levin stated that she likes Alternative 3 and Commissioner Klein stated that of those choices, he would prefer Alternative 3. Commissioner Barcus indicated that he is trying to figure out the difference between Alternatives 3 and 4. Audree stated that Alternative 3 is limited to the Planned Area and Alternative 4 is the CFA area. Commissioner Barcus then stated that he would prefer Alternative 4 and Commissioner Mayer stated him too. Commissioner Brandt asked if the Planned Area is the smaller Planned Area and Audree indicated it is the grey area. Commissioner Brandt indicated that is the smaller Planned Area and that is why Alternative 4 takes that away and makes it for the entire CFA. Vice Chair Levin then indicated that she changed her opinion to Alternative 4. Commissioner Brandt then stated that he is leaning towards Alternative 4, and Commissioner Cohen noted that it was Commissioner Brandt's idea.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he was just curious as to why there was an area that hadn't been considered and this is just the outcome of that. Commissioner Cohen indicated that Alternative 4 makes the most sense, if it is a choice between those four.

*Chair Losoff indicated that he would make it unanimous, so we seem to have pretty strong consensus on that action, and he likes the idea that it is for the entire CFA.*

Commissioner Cohen stated that one of the things that you proposed about lodging was that it created less traffic than homes, and commercial seems to increase traffic. He went to the roundabout today and he is very concerned about it. In the middle of the day on a Thursday, he saw a panel truck waiting and waiting coming down from Schnebly Hill, but do we have an idea of how much traffic the extra 250 ft. could create. Audree Juhlin stated that staff had not

done that analysis and that she would explain why staff supports the 750 ft. If you go back to the Vision Statement, it talks about a pedestrian-friendly area, and it is about creating a district that promotes walkability and uses that work together. We aren't looking at a district that is just random commercial; we're looking at commercial uses that support the local area like the art galleries, cafés and those things that are more conducive to our visitor uses, but also serving the local residents as well in a walking capacity. It is not necessarily those commercial uses that are driving destinations, but people will drive if there is an awesome hillside vineyard. We want those people who are staying in Uptown and visiting Tlaquepaque to walk to these uses. If we don't have a good base of commercial there, they are going to drive, so we want that continuity of commercial uses.

Chair Losoff indicated that is not to say that we should give up on traffic, but the reality is that in this area the way it is zoned now, there could be 260 houses with 260 cars at least, so whatever goes in there is going to have an impact on that circle. There is not much we can do about it today, but hopefully, when the traffic study is completed, there will be some alternatives to help improve that area. If we do nothing, there is still the potential of 260 houses, so whatever else goes in there will either be at least that and what we can do to minimize it. He is concerned the commercial will attract more people; it is making a bad situation worse. He doesn't know how we solve it, unless we philosophically agree no more approved projects until we have a traffic solution. He doesn't know what else we could do, but it is a problem and hopefully we will come up with an underpass or overpass or something to keep pedestrian traffic from clogging up those lanes, but he doesn't know if the issue is enough for the Commission not to act on this particular thing.

Commissioner Mayer stated that it goes back to the Commercial zone. He then asked if the previous public speaker's property is in the Commercial zone and Audree stated that would be within the 500 ft. limit. The Commissioner then indicated that it would be completely in there with 750 ft.; however, Audree explained that owner is within both limits. We're looking at it based on property lines, so his property would be eligible for that commercial use. The 750 ft. would allow both the Gassaway House and the Farley Cabins to have commercial uses with them, as well as the property that Warren highlighted. Commissioner Mayer then asked her to name a few commercial uses, and Audree repeated that, in the CFA, it is those uses that are more accessory to visitors like cafés and art galleries that you already see in the Uptown/Tlaquepaque areas, and lodging is part of that.

Commissioner Cohen asked about grocery stores and if they would fit in that zone. Vice Chair Levin pointed out that markets are in the list of possible uses. Commissioner Cohen then noted that we currently have some commercial in that area, so do we have any notion about how much traffic they create and what expanding the area will do in terms of that. Would that be part of the traffic study? Chair Losoff stated that the traffic study already pointed that out. Houses are worth X number of cars, lodging X number of cars, etc., the issue is that it is going to impact the traffic circle, but again unless we as the Commission develop the policy, we're not going to approve anything, because of traffic – it is there.

Commissioner Cohen stated that it is not a question of approving or not approving; he is trying to understand the difference between the 500 and 750 ft. in terms of what it could possibly do to the traffic circle. He is okay with the 500 ft. and might be okay with the 750, it is just his concern about that.

Cynthia Lovely indicated that another perspective is that whether it is 500 or 750, there is already a lot of people that walk around down there going to Tlaquepaque and possibly to Garlands and Hillside, and this is within that realm. We weren't necessarily envisioning a lot of people driving and parking here, but if they are already in the area to walk from Tlaquepaque, Gassaway or Farley is not that far. The other thing that was pointed out is that these may not be optimal housing or lodging areas, being that close to the roundabout.

Chair Losoff indicated that the overall concept is if we want commercial; his concern is that it is congested now, so he doesn't know if we want any more commercial, even though we're limiting it to 500 ft., so he would be apprehensive about commercial sites in that area, unless we can come up with some improvements.

Audree Juhlin explained that a key tool to manage traffic is land use, so if we propose a policy about preserving hillsides, open space, and creating access to the creekwalk by including lodging with a higher density, we want the land uses that help keep those users out of their vehicles and walking in the area. The string of pearls concept has been discussed at a macro level throughout the City, but on a much smaller level, what can we do with lodging in this area to make it easy to continue walking from your hotel to Tlaquepaque. We want them to feel that this is a walkable area, so land use, even commercial, can help if planned properly to reduce traffic impacts. Chair Losoff stated that in theory that is true, but right now you take your life in your hands if you walk there, so we have to see significant improvements.

Chair Losoff asked the Commissioners if they want commercial there, and Commissioner Barcus stated yes, 750 ft. makes sense. Looking at those parcels, it is pretty small square footage, so you aren't going to have large buildings with large amounts of traffic, because you don't have enough space to put in large parking lots, and we have those development regulations already in place. We are just talking about a couple of walkable buildings like galleries and/or cafés that might contribute to that walkability, so he would very strongly suggest going to 750 ft. to enhance the walkability of that entire area.

Commissioner Mayer stated that regarding the Chair's previous comment about holding off on anything until the traffic study is done, we don't know the outcome of the traffic study; it has to have a solution for that area too. If we are going to do that, the property owners are going to have some second thoughts. How long is it going to take to improve the traffic in that area before they can do anything? They could say forget about it, they aren't going to wait that long and do what they are entitled to do. Chair Losoff asked Commissioner Mayer if he had a preference and the Commissioner stated the 750 ft. if that makes sense, because there is a hillside on one side, so there is not going to be much happening there, and then the other side is the flat residential area, so not much is going to happen.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he wholeheartedly agrees with what Audree Juhlin said about the land use component and what Commissioner Barcus stated about the size of the properties. Vice Chair Levin stated that if you combine lots then it changes the thinking of increasing the frontage or distance from the roundabout, but that would be true of all of the parcels that are in single ownership. You could extinguish those lot lines six or seven lots up and be looking at it as an entire Planned Area within a Planned Area, so she is satisfied with 500 ft., but if it makes sense to staff to provide a little more, then she would accept the recommendation of 750 ft.

Commissioner Cohen stated that he is in favor of the 750 ft., but there has to be sidewalks there if we are trying to have pedestrian traffic; you could take your life in your hands trying to walk on that road. The sidewalk has to be on one side or the other for the length of that; we don't need them on both sides, but if the sidewalks are on that side, we would need a crosswalk. He is good with the 750, but we need a sidewalk whether the City pays for it or it is part of the use permit.

Commissioner Klein asked about staff's comment during the Soldiers Pass CFA about how far people are willing to walk and Cynthia Lovely indicated that we had the concentric circles at one-half and one-quarter mile, and she believes it was 15 minutes. Vice Chair Levin pointed out that was in the packet, and Audree Juhlin clarified it was in the previous presentation, and the area from the roundabout to the Creative Life Center is .4 of a mile and from Forest Road to the La Vista Motel is the same distance, so if we get the creek access and a bridge, it would

create an easy way to bridge the creek. Commissioner Klein then stated that he agreed with Commissioner Cohen about the sidewalks and 750 is okay with him.

*Chair Losoff stated that it sounded like there was a strong consensus.*

Commissioner Klein referenced the Single-Family Residential slide with all of the houses on the left scattered and the clustering with open space on the right, and asked if the clustering sample would depend on who owns what parcels. Couldn't you potentially have a worse situation with clustering in one area and all of the houses built in the other area? Warren Campbell explained that before you could cluster, you would have to be the owner of all of the property, and it would be restricted once it is approved. Cynthia Lovely then added that you could partner with a neighboring landowner. The Commissioner then asked how many landowners there are, and Commissioner Mayer pointed out that is just a sample. Commissioner Barcus added that there are agreements that could be made with other property owners that would be binding.

Warren Campbell explained that regardless of how many property owners there were, the land that is open in the sample would be tied to the new development, so development could not occur in the open area. Commissioner Klein then stated that he was confused, because if three or four landowners own the property, they could just go by the current zoning. Warren explained that goes back to the initial point that we are trying to develop a new zoning that entices the people to volunteer for that.

Chair Losoff stated that in the worst case scenario, he thinks Commissioner Klein is right, but we can provide limitations that would discourage that worst case scenario. Commissioner Barcus explained that you can't do clustering without a non-development agreement to preserve open space. You are not going to approve clustering on one parcel, assuming there would be open space on the other. We are not going to do that until the clustering parcel owner has a binding agreement with the other property owner to not develop it, and that's simple. Those are simple legal agreements. The Chair stated that they are not simple when you talk about individual properties, personalities, etc., but Commissioner Barcus stated if the agreement doesn't happen, it doesn't happen.

Audree Juhlin explained that to implement the CFA, we would create a new Land Development Code district, the property owners would have to submit a joint application for this rezoning, and they would all have to agree to the terms and conditions being submitted, allowed and restricted, so that Development Agreement would apply to every single property, even if under different ownership, and it would be recorded with the county with those restrictions or allowances on them.

Commissioner Klein asked what the incentive would be for a property owner to leave the property as open space, and Warren explained clustering the homes again. Commissioner Cohen asked which sample gives the developer more profit and Commissioner Barcus indicated the clustered sample on the right; the infrastructure with clustering is way less expensive than with sprawl, and we are trying to avoid sprawl, which on a micro-level, the sample on the left is sprawl and the one on the right is preserving open space.

Commissioner Cohen stated that he agreed, but he was concerned, because if the one on the left gave the developer more money, the one on the right would have less of a chance of happening, but Commissioner Mayer thinks it is more profitable to do the one on the right; however, Commissioner Mayer clarified that it depends on what is put in the open space. It can be very attractive and for the benefit of the people who live in the clustered area. It is a matter of the look, the amenities, etc. You can create a lot of amenities to attract buyers.

Commissioner Klein then asked what "Not to exceed the equivalent density" means, and Cynthia Lovely explained that whatever the original zoning is, so if your property is RS-10 and

you rezone to the new district, RS-10 is four units per acre, so you couldn't build more than 4 units per acre. Audree Juhlin indicated that it could say cannot exceed the base zoning density limitations. The Commissioner then asked if the sample on the left is RS-10 and that could be a couple hundred houses, then you are going to put a couple hundred houses in the sample on the right in that smaller area. Warren stated it is one-for-one; the same number of homes is shown in both samples. Vice Chair Levin added that it would be like Casa Contena and Audree Juhlin added with construction pads and common areas.

*Chair Losoff asked if there is agreement to strike the first sentence, and Commissioner Brandt stated that works for him, then other Commissioners also indicated agreement.*

Commissioner Cohen stated that eliminates the sample on the left-hand side and moves us to the right; however, Commissioner Barcus stated no, that is an option, not a requirement. Chair Losoff then commented that overall it is what we want for the City and this gives us some parameter to hopefully encourage that.

Cynthia Lovely referenced the multi-family residential slide and indicated it is almost identical to the Single-Family Residential slide in that we would remove any reference to density. Again, it would be equivalent to the base zoning and the difference from what they may have now is that with the new zone they would have the option to do multi-family, which is even more condensed than you see on the far right illustration, but it is essentially the same language as seen on the previous slide. Chair Losoff noted that it is striking the first and fourth bullets.

Commissioner Klein asked if a developer wanted to build clustered apartments, and they could have built 200 houses, then they could build 200 apartments, and Cynthia stated yes. Commissioner Cohen asked if the height restriction would remain 22 ft., and Cynthia explained that is a detail that the Commission may look at when we do the regulations. Commissioner Cohen then asked where the current 22 ft. regulation starts, and Audree explained that it is measured from the natural grade, so if the CFA is approved, staff will come back with a zoning district that talks about setbacks, heights, etc., so if you hold hard and fast to the 22 ft., staff will define that, or if you feel there is flexibility for an area that is depressed that could allow for greater height . . . Commissioner Cohen interrupted to ask about a higher area. Audree stated that the Commission would have the ability through the zoning district to talk about those specifics.

Commissioner Brandt stated that there previously was an incentive to allow an increase in density for multi-family according to the Heritage District on page 21, and Cynthia added that we also had the restriction to within 500 ft. of the roundabout. Commissioner Brandt agreed and noted that there is no restriction as to location – that is deleted, but there is no incentive to build it; it is just an easier way to cluster. Audree Juhlin indicated that the incentive is that they can't do multi-family right now, but through the zoning they have the ability to create condos, apartments, senior living, etc. Commissioner Brandt asked if there was a reason for reducing the density, and Warren Campbell indicated it was simply to address things staff heard, but if you think there needs to be some density increase, it could be different than four or two per acre. Commissioner Brandt pointed out that in the Sedona Community Plan, Community Expectations for this CFA was that there would be a continuation of low-cost housing, and what exists is actually in the RV park, which may or may not exist, but there is a Community Expectation that there would be affordable housing, so there should still be an incentive to allow higher density if you do multi-family residential, which usually is more affordable. There should be an incentive that is not just the density; it should be a higher density.

Audree Juhlin indicated that to address Commissioner Brandt's comments, we could add language that says in the case of deed-restricted affordable housing, you could have an extra allowance up to the 12 units per acre. If you are just doing condos or apartments at market rate, you would be restricted to the density allowed under the base zoning; however, if you are going to deed restrict them to ensure affordability, then you could have up to 12 units per acre.

Commissioner Brandt stated that works for him; he also wanted to follow it along with the Community Expectation and with his feelings for affordable housing that there should be that allowance with that protection and it is not just any multi-family.

Chair Losoff then asked if anybody disagrees with that suggestion, and Vice Chair Levin stated no. Commissioner Cohen indicated that he wanted to take it a step further, when you raise incentives for doing that, by increasing density allowable in the clustering sample, affordable or not, it might be more incentive to go to the clustered sample rather than the sample with sprawl. Commissioner Brandt explained that the whole premise is to allow a different zoning other than just the base, so it is automatically done to create open space – that is what the whole process is for. Commissioner Cohen agreed, but asked if the incentives for low-cost housing would also be incentives for non-low-cost housing, but help us get the clustered housing with all of that open space.

Chair Losoff stated that we do want to be conscious of developers' needs, but what is best for the City and if the right-hand side is best, then developers' need to conform. Commissioner Cohen stated that he liked the open space idea, but when suggesting an incentive, could we do the same to ensure that we get that open space by giving developers the opportunity to build more housing and go in that direction. Audree Juhlin suggested that perhaps instead of the equivalent of 1:1, you make it like 1:1.25 or something like that, and Commissioner Cohen stated yes, so he could build more clustered apartments with open space.

Commissioner Brandt stated that does make sense and we started with residential being limited to one per acre, which was a de-incentive, so that is on the right track to create more open space and preserve the existing meadows. Chair Losoff asked how dense it would become if we do that; would it become too dense? Commissioner Brandt indicated 1:25 or something to give a little incentive, and Commissioner Mayer expressed that it should be up to the developer as to whether the incentives are wanted or not.

Commissioner Brandt explained that if you have land in a floodway, you can't really develop it anyway, but if you cluster, you get to put it in places that are built on, and that is kind of what happened with Casa Contenta.

Commissioner Barcus summarized that the understanding is that the incentive for additional units would only apply to people who deed restrict for affordable housing and Commissioner Brandt added for multi-family. Chair Losoff stated yes, we agreed to that. Commissioner Barcus continued to say it isn't just apartments or rentals; it could be owner-occupied condos, etc. Vice Chair Levin then asked if staff is going to come up with that metric and Warren Campbell stated that staff is looking to the Commission to come up with that metric, to shift people away from the sprawled to the clustered development, and Commissioner Cohen is saying that 1:1 may not be enough. Commissioner Barcus commented that the 1:1.25 factor would take it from 12 to 16 and that seems to be the upper limit.

Chair Losoff pointed out that there are two things going on here. First, we have the affordable housing and we agreed that we would like language about the deed restrictions. The other issue is if we want to provide more density when not connected to affordable housing, but for single-family residential. He would probably prefer not to, and Commissioner Barcus stated he didn't understand what was just said, so Chair Losoff asked if we want to provide incentives for single-family dwellings with a higher density of 1.25 or whatever. Cynthia Lovely then clarified that we are discussing multi-family.

Audree Juhlin tried to simplify it by saying that in the lodging discussion, we talked about doubling the density, and we are now discussing density for multi-family. Do you want something similar where we double or have half of that, etc., or an equivalent to the base zoning?

Commissioner Mayer commented that we have to look at the traffic again, and Commissioner Cohen explained that we are looking for the kind of incentives that would lead developers and property owners to the clustered sample. An incentive to make the right-hand side happen would be a good thing, and he is not limiting it to multi-family housing or single-family housing, because he would like staff to give the Commission a proposal on what that would mean, in terms of density, size, etc., and if that would work. If he were doing the development, you have to follow the money and there is more money if you allow more development.

Chair Losoff wanted to know if there is a consensus before staff does that research. Commissioner Mayer stated no, Vice Chair Levin asked if we could go back to the original formula to look at it as an equivalency to residential or increase it as we did with lodging. Chair Losoff pointed out that is what Commissioner Cohen is suggesting.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that we are discussing guidelines and policy, so can we agree that some incentive is desirable and determine the incentive in the development regulations after the CFA is approved? Audree Juhlin responded yes and no, for staff to write the zoning district, we need some guidelines and if you are interested in increasing it to more than the allowed density, we would have to have that spelled out in general terms. The language could be as simple as saying that some increase in density may be allowed in exchange for the benefits identified, and then the district itself will define what those density limits are.

Chair Losoff pointed out that the Commission is discussing a concept that in and of itself is an incentive, and Commissioner Brandt stated by multi-family, yes, but we are beyond that; we're talking about residential. The Chair then asked what more incentives we want; you have more open space and clustering; however, Commissioner Brandt clarified that is what we want, but how do we get the developer to do that?

Commissioner Cohen pointed out that was his question regarding the incentive of increasing the number of units in that area, so we can get the open space. If we don't do that, there is no reason for anybody to go that way unless they think they can sell more houses, because they created a deal with open space. Commissioner Barcus commented to keep in mind that their cost will be lower with the infrastructure by clustering, so there is an incentive built into clustering.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that Commissioner Cohen constantly came up with a traffic concern, and now he wants to increase the density or allowance on residential too, and that increases the traffic. We need some agreement that whatever increases the traffic should not be considered, especially incentives to even build more. Commissioner Cohen responded that he keeps hearing that we can't do anything about the traffic, so that is a good point, but if we can't do anything about it and we want incentives for open space, how much more traffic are we talking about? He has no idea and no idea if it would even work, but he is raising it as a question.

Chair Losoff then asked if the Commission wants to pursue it as a group. Do we have a consensus that we should pursue this approach? Commissioner Barcus stated that he is good with the language not being specific, but in the zoning district, the incentive for additional units can be addressed at that time. Commissioner Mayer stated it's a pain; what is up there is good.

Commissioner Brandt summarized that we have completely zoned residential property, and we have talked about incentives to create open space for the meadows, the creek, the hillsides and their potential to do lodging. We talked about the densities there, and that they have the potential to do multi-family, which is a different zoning district, so they could rezone to multi-family, and we are all in agreement with that. Then, Commissioner Cohen raised a good point. If they just want to do residential, do we need an incentive for that, and creating open space is important in this area for the meadows, creek and hillsides, so he thinks that there should be some incentive or it is just going to be developed monopoly-house style like the left side, so he

would say 10%, 15% or even 20% if it is clustered. If they don't do that, then no, it doesn't get the density increase.

Vice Chair Levin agreed with staff's recommendation that we spell it out in general terms up to, and that can come back to us with the development standards that we will see after the CFA is adopted, but she would like to underscore that we increase the number for deeded affordable housing.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he agrees with what Commissioner Barcus, Commissioner Brandt and Vice Chair Levin stated. Commissioner Barcus explained a way to go about doing this, Commissioner Brandt explained what we are trying to accomplish, and Vice Chair Levin reemphasized affordable housing, so he agrees with them. Commissioner Klein indicated that by allowing them to cluster, it will save them money, so that is an incentive. He would agree that maybe we could increase the density for deeded affordable housing, but he is concerned about doing that for regular housing. The traffic thing we got last time said that the capacity on S.R. 179 south of Ranger Road is 19,500 cars a day, and it estimates that by 2025, we will have 24,376 cars per day in that area, which is about a 25% to 35% increase from where we are now, so that will significantly exceed the capacity of the road; therefore he would not be in favor of allowing anything other than the equivalent density for regular housing, because of his concern about traffic. With all due respect to the traffic study, traffic has been discussed for how many years and nothing has ever happened, so he is a little pessimistic as to if anything significant will happen. The level of service is already E to F in that area, so if you increase the traffic by 25% to 35%, that is an unacceptable situation.

Chair Losoff stated that he also would not be inclined to increase density, but density can go in different ways. A lot of experts say that density should go up, but he wouldn't want it to go up in that area, because of the viewshed, etc. He would be apprehensive about increasing the density other than for affordable housing. We have two Commissioners saying no and four saying that they want to investigate it, so he guesses that staff should come back with some thoughts or recommendations on increasing density and the impact it would have on traffic, etc.

Audree Juhlin indicated that five Commissioners support perhaps a slight increase in density and two don't, so we will bring back language in the CFA to increase the density and make it very general, not specific, then the district will get into the details of the specific density allowances in exchange for benefits. If we are done with the discussion today, staff would ask for a motion to continue this item to the next meeting available, which would be November 1<sup>st</sup>, and we will have a draft ready for action hopefully on that date.

Commissioner Barcus referenced page 8 and indicated that he took exception with the statement in the middle of the paragraph about Schnebly Hill Road was once a viable route. The suggestion that improving the road to acceptable transportation engineering standards would be extremely costly is unfounded; we don't know those costs, so you could strike "extremely" and just say costly. Additionally in the CFA vision, small-scaled buildings was changed to modest-scaled buildings, but he is having a problem understanding what small, modest, medium, large or whatever might be. We need to be more thoughtful about how we . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to say that at the last meeting, there was no dis-consent with that, so do we need to put it to a vote? Warren Campbell noted that "modest" would get defined in that new zoning district, and Commissioner Barcus then indicated that he was good with that.

Commissioner Cohen stated that he wanted to go back to density and indicated that if all we are discussing is increasing density; he is not in favor of increasing density on the left-hand side map, and the only reason he would favor increasing density in that area at all would be to accomplish lower-cost housing and to buy the green space. Chair Losoff again stated that we are all in agreement with affordable housing, and Commissioner Cohen agreed and repeated that his second reason is to buy the green space, and if we aren't doing that, then he is not in favor of increasing density, except for affordable housing. Audree Juhlin noted that was the



premise that allowed for an increase in density if we are able to achieve the outcomes – preservation of the hillside, the open space, the access to the creek, and that is the only way you would get the added incentive of density.

Commissioner Cohen asked if there is a way to structure the wording so we are looking at green space. If we can't get that, why bother increasing the density. Cynthia Lovely pointed out that, in the CFA Plan, we have been discussing revisions to page 21, when talking about possibly modifying the multi-family language. On page 22, the development guidelines already talk about preserving Oak Creek, open space, viewshed and habitat preservation, so regardless of what the previous language was, if you rezone to the new district, these are like the conditions. Audree Juhlin added that we can say specifically that an increase may be allowed as long as it is achieving those strategies, goals and objectives.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he is prepared to make a motion after asking one more question. Regarding access to Oak Creek, someone was going to provide a map of how we could access Oak Creek, but they didn't do that, so he doesn't understand how they are going to access Oak Creek. Cynthia Lovely stated that is to be determined and Commissioner Brandt asked if page 26 shows that. Cynthia indicated very generally, but we don't have more specifics than shown on page 26, which was intentionally left vague. There are a lot of factors that would go into the placement – topography, land ownership, willing landowners, etc. At this point, we couldn't give an exact alignment of where that would be. Commissioner Cohen then stated that his problem is that the Community Plan is quite specific about developing public access to Oak Creek and he doesn't know how to visualize that.

Audree Juhlin stated that if the Commissioner wants more structured and guaranteed access to the creek, then the Commission will want to recommend to the City Council to look at ways to explore purchasing easements or property for those access points. If the Council agrees, then City staff would create Capital Improvement Programs around that direction.

***Motion: Commissioner Cohen so moved if it is acceptable.***

Vice Chair Levin asked the Commissioner to hold that motion in abeyance; however, the Commissioner stated that we could discuss it if the Chair accepts it. The Vice Chair then stated that she has a point of clarification and two comments before you close the Commission comments. Commissioner Brandt added that he would like to know if Commissioner Barcus was done with his question, and Commissioner Barcus stated yes.

***Motion died for lack of a second.***

Chair Losoff noted that the Commission is all over the board, and we are approving a CFA Plan. He doesn't know if we are here to tell the City Council to buy land to create bridges or overpasses; that is going beyond our scope. He understands that the plan should be specific and pages 25 and 26 talk about the creek, etc. We say specifically that a creekwalk along Oak Creek should be considered, designed to have minimal impact, easements should be established, bridges may be considered, etc., so he doesn't know what else the Commission can do. Commissioner Cohen asked about the action plan and said the City has talked about this for a long time. Chair Losoff stated that we have talked about a creekwalk for 25 years, but we aren't here to discuss a creekwalk; that is not our purview today. We are looking at a CFA Plan that includes specific language regarding creek access.

Audree Juhlin explained that staff wouldn't want a motion today; however, it could be appropriate when making a motion to accept and move the CFA forward, to say as you are considering this, you may also want to consider that, but not now. It doesn't have to be that you recommend that the City Council look at exploring easement access as part of the discussion for future budgets. Chair Losoff stated that a lot of things could be included – overpasses, etc., but that is far beyond our scope, unless we want to put it in the conditions;

however, Audree indicated not necessarily. As you recommend approval of the CFA, if the Commission feels really strongly about a certain component that we are not able to achieve to your satisfaction, you can say as a side note to please accept this recommendation to approve the CFA and we also feel strongly about the creekwalk access and would recommend the Council explore ways to get it rather than waiting for development to come forward. It is okay to have that kind of recommendation in your motion, but not tonight.

Commissioner Brandt suggested showing more of the potential network, for instance, why not just show another potential crossing of the creek. Burris Lane could connect to the trails, a trail from the highway right-of-way to the creek and continuing behind properties. If they are all potential . . . Chair Losoff interrupted to point out that page 26 has a reference. Commissioner Barcus then asked if Commissioner Brandt would favor more rather than just a few. Cynthia Lovely explained that it was intentionally more cartoonish, because we are just illustrating that we want a network – north, south, east, west, without getting into specifics. When we start getting into more detail and lines, we get more calls from property owners, so it is not intended to show it being on any particular property, because we haven't gotten to that stage of research, so she hesitates to draw in more lines. Audree Juhlin then clarified that Figure 9 is an example of potential network locations, and Commissioner Barcus noted that it says at the bottom that this is conceptual only.

Vice Chair Levin asked for a point of clarification regarding the monthly rentals at the RV park being characterized as affordable housing at \$650/month. She then asked if those are typically new leases and comparable with Sunset or is that month-to-month. Audree Juhlin explained that she doesn't know that we made the assumption that is affordable; we just provided the information that by month-to-month, the land lease is \$650, without making any claim or connection to affordability. The Community Plan described the area as providing affordable housing, but she can't say that it is. Cynthia Lovely noted that statement was a carryover from 1998, so it was considered affordable at that time, and the Community Expectations taken from the Community Plan has some language that says this is a starting point to develop a CFA Plan. The CFA Plan will sort of replace that page and that language wasn't necessarily there to be taken verbatim into the CFA Plan. It was carried over and the CFA Plan recognizes the fact that it may not be affordable housing the way it used to be. They do offer long-term, but monthly. The Vice Chair noted that it is month-to-month then and comparable to Sunset.

Vice Chair Levin then referenced the City acquiring easements for creek access, but in addition to that we would want to look at commercial and lodging uses for providing creek access where feasible, as opposed to residential areas. Cynthia Lovely pointed out that is on page 21, if you are going to rezone to the new district and had property where a creekwalk might make sense, yes. The Vice Chair stated that she is saying that it would make more sense that commercial and lodging uses would be providing that access, as opposed to residential areas. Cynthia then explained the language on page 22 doesn't distinguish which use. The Vice Chair then asked if Cynthia felt that was appropriate for all uses to provide that where feasible, and Cynthia repeated that it depends on if a property owner comes in, where the property is, if there is a likely trail on it, etc., and what are they going to propose. Chair Losoff and Commissioner Cohen pointed out that page 25 talks about it, and Commissioner Cohen added that Cynthia already wrote a good one in there. Vice Chair Levin then stated that on page 31, it would be important to discourage trail use parking and emphasize walking, so we are not bringing more traffic to the trail via cars.

Chair Losoff asked if staff had enough to bring back next time and Audree Juhlin indicated yes, for recommended approval to the City Council, and she pointed out that a motion is needed to continue this item to November 1<sup>st</sup>.

Commissioner Cohen asked if staff wanted a motion to continue this to November 1<sup>st</sup> and Audree indicated yes.

***MOTION: Commissioner Cohen so moved. Vice Chair Levin seconded.***

Donna Puckett stated that there should be a reading of the motion, because no one on the dais had stated the content for a motion.

***MOTION: Vice Chair Levin moved to continue this hearing to November 1<sup>st</sup> on the Schnebly Hill CFA. Commissioner Cohen seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.***

Vice Chair Levin expressed appreciation for staff focusing the questions from meeting to meeting and providing additional data; it seems that it has been a great way to develop CFAs and keep the Commission on track.

*The Chair recessed the meeting for a break at 5:40 p.m. and reconvened at 5:45 p.m.*

**4. Discussion regarding the Draft Ranger Station Park Master Plan. Applicant: City of Sedona Case Number: PZ16-00011 (MP)**

**Presentation, Cynthia Lovely:** Cynthia explained that the Commissioners had been provided with an option A and B of the proposed park layout, and stated that last January, staff went to the City Council with the conceptual proposal, and they had staff move forward. A consultant, Norris Designs, was hired, and they are working on this, so it is a work in progress. They have done this layout and a rough estimate of probably cost, and they are currently working on schematic designs. We hope to have that package ready for Council on November 10<sup>th</sup>, and at that time we will forward any comments the Commission has.

Chair Losoff asked who the representative is on this and Cynthia stated that staff is currently working with a consultant. There was a workgroup and Commissioner Brandt was in that group, but currently, it is her, Rachel Murdoch in Parks & Recreation and Andy Dickey in Public Works.

Cynthia noted that one of the features in the conceptual plan was a walking path and this is in Option B, but she is not going through the whole options. There are two different ones, because one has a community garden and there are two different scenarios for pickleball. It is not being presented as an either/or option; it is just a way to illustrate without six versions. When it is presented to the City Council, it will be sort of a menu and we expect to have the base, especially with costs. There was some question about pickleball, so that may be either an add-on or they may look at things in priorities as to when things may be built. The other piece of this was a community garden that wasn't on the original recommended proposal. There were a lot of suggestions to consider community gardens, so that is another potential add-on, and those are the type of things we expect City Council to determine.

Cynthia Lovely pointed out that today, we don't need to get into whether or not there would be pickleball or community gardens, etc., that will be left to later when we have our probable costs more accurately defined, but we will forward general feedback and comments to the City Council, as well as anything that needs to be addressed in this draft. As far as basic features, the perimeter trail is shown and along Brewer Road, it would double as the sidewalk following Brewer Road and eventually connect with Ranger Road and extend to the south, which will come up later in our CFA planning as to how we want all of these pedestrian connections. Cynthia pointed out that the other pedestrian connection shown is a pass-through into the Tlaquepaque parking lot, just north of El Portal. Chair Losoff then asked about the location of the connection to Los Abrigados, which Cynthia identified as a second pedestrian connection and indicated that there is already a gate into their parking lot, so hopefully, there would be one pedestrian connection to the south and one east into Tlaquepaque, plus the sidewalk along Brewer Road.

Cynthia Lovely then referenced the barn and house, which are both historic landmarks on the National Register, and indicated that the design has attempted to be very sensitive to those

buildings, not altering their immediate surroundings, because we want to retain their view from the roadway. Another feature is the plaza north of the barn. It is now a parking area, but we are proposing to improve that and the surfacing would be decomposed granite; historically, it was a working barn. The lawn was a major recreational feature modeled off of Sunset Park, and we have a children's play area on the south side. The recommendations were for more of a natural play area as opposed to a plastic playground, but we don't have all of those details yet, although we are hoping for some examples by November 10<sup>th</sup>.

Cynthia explained that there are 44 parking spaces, and she believes there already is an agreement with the school district across the street and they have roughly 36 parking spaces, so similar to Posse Grounds, if there is an event we would be able to use their parking lot.

Cynthia then indicated that the main purpose tonight is to find out if the Commission has any comments.

#### **Commission's Discussion:**

Commissioner Barcus referenced the 80 parking spaces and indicated that it seems like an enormous amount of parking for such a dinky little park, so help him understand how we came up with more parking than park. Cynthia indicated that she thought he was going to have the opposite reaction; we've heard both, but more that this is not enough. The reason people think it is not enough is if you had multiple things going on at the park like the house and barn rented for a wedding and pickleball with multiple players, and the lawn, and if you add up all of the different things happening at the same time, that is one reason for the parking.

Commissioner Barcus then commented that the consultant included the 36 across the street when computing the number. It just seems to be far too much parking, planning for the worst case scenario, so that would be his feedback. Cynthia Lovely stated that another thought was that if we don't provide enough, this particular location does not have good on-street parking, so we would hate to not have enough and have it pushed into the neighborhoods.

Andy Dickey added that we do hear from Parks & Recreation that our other parks don't have enough parking; not that we want to over-park it and create something that we don't want, but at the same time, they had a desire to certainly have enough parking. Commissioner Barcus indicated that for most weddings he has seen, people use shuttles, so he thinks we need to be careful about putting so much parking in so little park on such a great space.

Chair Losoff asked about the size of this park compared to Sunset and Cynthia indicated that this one is 3.5 acres, but she can't remember Sunset. "We actually did compare them closely and in acreage, Sunset might be off a little bit, because of the big wash that goes through it, but Sunset has 32 parking spots and Rachel said that absolutely is not enough, because it is a problem for them and this park has far more facilities than Sunset Park. The school district parking would be for after hours, so when they are operational Monday – Friday, we wouldn't be using their parking.

Commissioner Mayer asked if the park is going to be fenced and manned. Cynthia Lovely stated no, and the Commissioner then asked about liability. Cynthia explained that it is the same situation as for all of our parks, as well as any park in the State of Arizona. Commissioner Mayer indicated that he agrees about the parking spaces for Sunset. It is a completely different story; there is some residential, but to get to it from other areas, it takes a car to get there. This venue will be used more likely by people who stay at the Portal Lane Country Inn, Los Abrigados, etc., so he doesn't think there is a need for 44 spaces. He then asked if it would be hooked up to the sewer and Andy Dickey stated yes. Commissioner Mayer again indicated that he sees more use for the tourists than the locals, and he wondered if liquor will be allowed for special events. Cynthia explained that it would be the same policy as for the other parks. The Commissioner then asked if there could be private venues held there, and Cynthia stated yes, the thought on both the barn and house is that those could be rented out for community use; the fees are to be determined. Commissioner Mayer then recalled that where the offices are for Los Abrigados with Portal Lane next to it, there used to

be a gate there too, so is that the one you are talking about? Cynthia explained that she is not aware of a gate there. Andy Dickey explained to get to that area, you would have to come off of Brewer Road and go through the Tlaquepaque employee parking lot and it comes in next to the El Portal property, but for our Transportation Master Plan, we are looking at making a connection between Portal Lane and Brewer Road.

Commissioner Mayer indicated that he could see some people wanting to entertain their children; he then asked if pickleball is still a question mark. Andy Dickey asked to qualify what he said in that we would not actually be crossing Soldier Wash; it would more than likely come in by the lift station. Regarding pickleball, Cynthia stated that will be up to Council. Commissioner Cohen stated that P&Z recommended no pickleball and the City Council put pickleball in, as it stands now.

Commissioner Brandt stated that the plan works really well from the discussions we had with the special planning group. His initial thought was that it seemed that where the administration building is has the most dense area of trees and that is where the majority of the parking is, so it took him a while to get his head around that, because we had looked at parking perhaps out of sight, so it brought more of the uses of the green closer to the street, so people could see what was going on in the existing shade, so he still is curious as to why. Cynthia Lovely explained that we had earlier versions that were different. The majority of the trees on the entire property are “weed” trees. Ailanthus, called the tree of heaven, is all over the property, so a lot of the trees around the green building are being removed, and the other issue regarding the parking was that we had feedback that if you are on the lawn or in the children’s play area, you want a quiet park experience, so it was moved away from the road. An earlier design had all of that by the road, but the feedback was that traffic was going up and down Brewer Road, so it would be preferable to have the parking lot serve as a buffer, so when you are on the lawn, it is more of a quiet experience. The earlier design had the parking lot to the east, and the lawn had a road on one side and parking on the other side.

Commissioner Brandt stated that the parking works really well and every bit of parking will be used when there are special events, considering that this was to be a big gathering spot for the City. There could be a lot of uses going on there with the historic house and barn, and also passive use of the green space, and not just for tourists, but also for all locals that want a park that is more of a relaxing place and that is why pickleball is such a concern. The community garden came up a lot in discussions at the round table and it is a great idea. We probably need to provide some nearby parking for people hauling a hose, dirt, etc., although it is not a good place for parking along that bend or if it changes the historic nature, so that is a challenge. He then noted that there currently is head-on parking right across from the administration building, but that is erased and where the three trees are. Maybe there is a place along there where you get good sightlines and could do one or two places for parking. Cynthia Lovely agreed that it is a challenge; we have two issues – one is the house in that we don’t want to see structures, a parking lot or driveway too close, and second are safety issues with the sightlines and the curve, so we would rather not have any driveways on the north side, and we don’t want any parking that requires backing out into the road. It is definitely constrained and is not a large area on the north end.

Commissioner Brandt noted that the trees are arching around the big green space. There are Cottonwoods and established shade trees out there that he would want to see incorporated. It seems that of course they would do that, but no, when you have a plan and that tree is in the middle of the parking lot, they take it down, so he would like to keep the significant trees within the plan. There was also discussion about the natural vegetation, and this looks like a very polished green park, although it says that they had lawn around the house with native grass, but there could be areas where it is not so intensively green like by the pickleball courts where there is a natural bank with yuccas and natural vegetation, so that should be more highlighted, because there was some discussion around the roundtable that there should be a more historic, rustic feel to this, not a polished suburban-style park.

Commissioner Mayer asked about switching the community garden to the area where the pickleball is, because you have nearby parking. Cynthia Lovely indicated that they can look into it, but she

doubts that there is enough room on the north end for the pickleball. Commissioner Mayer stated that it looks the same to him.

Chair Losoff asked if their recommendation is going to have any impact tonight or is this just FYI, and Cynthia indicated that there are two pieces – one is if there is anything we need to adjust on the plan, and second is that we can forward your comments to Council; for example, that you preferred not to have pickleball. The Chair then indicated that a suggestion is switching pickleball for the sake of parking with the community garden or by having the possible future connection to Tlaquepaque could people park there and come across? Cynthia explained that part of the walkability is if they are going to Tlaquepaque for lunch or shopping, we would hope they would leave their car parked and walk, but the parking for the garden is something we will have to discuss more. Commissioner Brandt noted that it probably could just be parallel parking along the shoulder of the road.

Commissioner Mayer asked if food trucks would be allowed and Cynthia stated yes, that was in the conceptual proposal, and that was another comment heard that we will take back and discuss. When this was drawn up, the thought was that the food trucks could park anywhere in the parking lot, but there was also a question of whether or not there should be designated sites for the food trucks. The Commissioner indicated that food trucks move, unless they need a connection. Commissioner Brandt noted the little lobe of parking that goes to the south of the barn would be for like if you were staging something, and the visitors predominantly would be in the arcing part, so the food trucks could be in that little lobe and out of the way of traffic going through the parking lot.

Vice Chair Levin stated that she liked the idea of a community garden and its adjacency to the Ranger House.. She would not want to see an active recreation activity in that area, but as to pickleball, it isn't appropriate at all on this site, and she wanted to underscore that. It compromises the integrity of the National Registered property. It has nothing to do with the Ranger House and Barn. She agrees with Commissioner Brandt about making a little more edge to the amenities brought into the park, and she is not sure if the scale of the large green grass area is appropriate. It goes toward large events and children and whatever they might want to do in that area, but it seems so highly cultivated for a historic property. Cynthia Lovely explained that the reactions we are getting have to do with the color of the design. The Vice Chair stated that she is imaging that is grass edge-to-edge and it takes up roughly one-third of the entire 3.5 acres; however, Commissioner Brandt noted that Rachel would love that. She was saying that people want to have volleyball, unstructured play like croquet, so Parks & Recreation would like to see that size. Vice Chair Levin indicated that she understands that, and then asked about the demonstration garden. Cynthia Lovely explained that the intent was native demonstrations with native plants labeled, like a small botanical garden; it doesn't mean that we wouldn't have native plants elsewhere, but it would just be set-up to demonstrate what the different plants are. The Vice Chair then stated that maybe it isn't really "demonstration"; however, Cynthia pointed out it is demonstration in the sense that everything would be labeled. Vice Chair Levin then asked if the plan includes signage and interpretation of the history of the buildings, etc. Cynthia indicated yes and pointed out the proposed location of an interpretative kiosk near the barn. The Vice Chair stated that sounds good, and overall she likes the spacing, how it is being treated around the buildings and active recreation is being provided by that trail, so it doesn't need to be pickleball.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that he also likes the trail, but it needs some distance markers for people using it for exercise. We may also want to ask Rachel about having exercise stations. Then as to pickleball and the children's play areas, they need to be closer to the parking than the garden, because if he was bringing his children to a play area, the less walking across a parking area with them, the safer and better. He then asked about the black areas near the pickleball courts, and Cynthia Lovely indicated that she believes they are trellises for shade and benches. The Commissioner indicated he didn't see any benches around the children's play area, which are essential for the parents; security for children is of top importance. We also may want benches in the big green thing, so people can sit and watch the action, etc. Regarding the pickleball courts, he has to say he is in antipathy to it as previously stated, so is there any thought as to what to do with

those courts when pickleball is no longer popular, which happens with a lot of fad sports and is already happening with pickleball in some areas. He watched empty pickleball courts for a while on the east coast, and they are expensive, so that is a question to think about. It is probably the size of one tennis court. Chair Losoff agreed that it is the size of a tennis court; you can get four courts on one tennis court. Commissioner Cohen then added that he likes the plan in general very much.

Commissioner Klein asked about the surface of the children's play area, and Cynthia Lovely stated that we haven't gotten to that yet. The Commissioner stated that the cushioning material is needed, because if you have a hard material, there have been lots of lawsuits against governmental entities when they fall off of the swings, and if they land on something hard and get a significant head injury, you could be talking about millions of dollars. Cynthia noted that now that is standard park design. Commissioner Klein then asked what would happen to the fruit from the orchard and Cynthia indicated that one suggestion from the public was to have it open like a community garden. Then, the Commissioner asked the same question about the vegetables in the community garden. Cynthia explained that the concept of a community garden is that volunteers adopt a section of the garden, but there are all sorts of models and one of Rachel's concerns is, what happens when the garden is no longer maintained or adopted, and the operation of a community garden is a significant consideration and part of why it didn't make the cut in the conceptual proposal.

Commissioner Klein stated that the Commission already made our recommendation to the City Council that we were opposed to pickleball and the Historic Preservation Commission has already opposed it, but the City Council said they want pickleball, so he questions the appropriateness of the Commission making another recommendation to the City Council that we are opposed to pickleball. Chair Losoff stated that the Commission could reaffirm the initial decision in our discussion; not as a motion.

Commissioner Barcus commented that when we put in parks we change speed limits, so what is the standard speed limit in park zones and could this be lowered to the lower end of the scale. Some park zones are 20 mph, some are 15 mph, some are 10 mph and when he has been in that part of town, the 25 mph is being exceeded. Commissioner Mayer commented that it is almost like a school zone. Andy Dickey explained that we could do a speed study in the area to determine if that change should be made, but we would have to do some analysis and come up with certain criteria that would lead us in that direction. It is possible that we should . . . Commissioner Barcus interrupted to mention that he is also a big fan of speed humps, plus there will be 36 parking spaces available, so people are going to have to cross that street safely. He would recommend the lowest practical speed limit and the highest number of speed humps possible along the park frontage. Andy explained that regarding the speed humps, there are criteria to go through to be able to implement those, and that is City right-of-way through there.

Chair Losoff commented that the speed study would be imperative with a lot of people going there, it needs to be done upfront before it starts. He then summarized that food trucks came on pretty strong in our initial concept that we wanted them, but where would we put them? There was also discussion about more amenities like volleyball, etc., and the big green space looks big and at first he thought it was a pool, but things like croquet would be more appropriate than pickleball, and he also votes against pickleball. If we put pickleball in, we don't need more than four courts – more than that is pushing it; of the two options he likes the one with two. An exercise trail would be good, and certainly play area seating would be nice, preferably in the shade outside of the play area.

Commissioner Mayer asked about an exercise area with logs, etc., and Cynthia indicated that she believes they are putting exercise stations in Posse Grounds. The Commissioner then asked if the people will just be able to look at the buildings or be able to enter the buildings; what will happen inside the buildings. Cynthia Lovely again explained the plan for community groups, weddings, etc., to use them as rentals, and they could be used for community events. One idea was to have an "art in the park", and those could be hosted by the City or a group. The Commissioner then asked if there would be no historic display of what the Ranger Station was before, and Cynthia again explained the interpretative signs with pictures and pointed out that this is not addressing the

renovation of the buildings. The Commissioner then indicated it would be nice to have a little history there too; however, Chair Losoff pointed out that we have the historic park on Jordan Road.

Commissioner Cohen asked about lighting for security reasons, and Cynthia stated that is another detail we haven't gotten to yet. Chair Losoff asked what happens next and Vice Chair Levin asked about the timetable. Cynthia again explained that November 10<sup>th</sup>, it will go to the City Council with possibly a refined version of this, given the comments, the estimate of probable costs and schematic designs, and we expect to have a menu for the Council to give us some direction as to what will be on that menu, as well as the priorities. Then, we will finalize all of the documentation and go to the next stage of design development. Additionally, the old green administrative office building is being removed plus three sheds, but first, some hazard mitigation work has to be completed in the next couple of months. Commissioner Mayer asked what will happen to the demo material, and Cynthia indicated that hasn't been discussed yet.

The Chair then asked how the Commission's comments would be incorporated, and Cynthia explained that the Commission's comments will be forwarded on for the November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting with Council and some suggestions on the design in the presentation may be adjusted, given the comments; for example, benches are on there, but they are hard to see. She, Andy and Rachel also will be reviewing all comments and will possibly be making more changes. The Chair then stated that the Commission is reiterating pickleball; it looks like it will be a nice park, but like anything else, there will always be room for modifications.

#### **5. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**

- a. Tuesday, October 18, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)
- b. Thursday, October 27, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)
- c. Tuesday, November 1, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)
- d. Thursday, November 10, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)

Warren Campbell stated that October 18<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> have been canceled. On November 1<sup>st</sup>, we have the Conceptual Review for the Marriott Residence Inn; a review of the ADU regulations, which is really no longer applicable with SB1350; another review of Article 15, and the Schnebly Hill CFA. November 10<sup>th</sup> is canceled, since Council meetings are pushed back for the week of the election, but there will be a Land Development Code meeting with the consultant on November 15<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Barcus requested that an email with that information be sent to the Commission and Warren indicated that an email with all of the dates and times would be provided.

#### **6. EXECUTIVE SESSION**

If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:

- a. To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).
- b. Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.

*No Executive Session was held.*

#### **7. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 6:27 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on October 13, 2016.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

---

Date